

Interview Summary	Application No. 08/444,790	Applicant(s) BROCKHAUS ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph F. Murphy	Art Unit 1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph F. Murphy.

(3) Rosemary Sweeny.

(2) Sharon M. Sintich.

(4) Lilly Rin-Laures.

Date of Interview: 20 September 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the obviousness type double patenting rejection, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph. Discussed Applicant's plan to submit an information disclosure statement.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


JOSEPH MURPHY
PATENT EXAMINER
 Examiner's signature, if required